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Appendix 4: Expert Sessions (Materials & Outputs)

Expert Panel 1: Community, Leisure & Cultural Facilities

AGENDA

16.30 1. Welcome & Introductions
16.40 3. Overview of Proposals for Cultural, Sports & Community Facilities
   ➢ A short presentation and paper* on current proposals
16.50 4. Topic 1: The Overall Offer
   ➢ Expert Panel (30 min)
   ➢ What are the pros and cons of the proposals in general?
   ➢ What have we missed, particularly with reference to other regional cities?
   ➢ What should our priorities and why – the most have vs nice to have?
   ➢ Q&A with Contributors (10 min)
17.20 5. Topic 2: Location and Mixed Use
   ➢ Expert Panel (30 min)
   ➢ What are the pros and cons of the proposed locations in general?
   ➢ What facilities work well in mixed use developments – with what other uses?
   ➢ What facilities will work at upper levels (for example, above retail at ground floor)?
   ➢ What should be our priority locations and why?
   ➢ Q&A with Contributors (10 min)

* paper to follow
Expert Panel 1: Community, Leisure & Cultural Facilities (Materials)
CMK Alliance Plan

Expert Panel Session
Cultural, Sport & Community Facilities

26th June 2012
4.30 - 6.30
Theatre MK Boardroom

Neighbourhood Development Plans

What is a Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- A new planning tool introduced by the Localism Act 2011
- About promoting or improving the social, economic, and environmental well-being of an area
- Sets out planning policies in relation to the development and use of land in a particular area (Design Statements or Master Plans)
- A tool to bring forward sustainable development and growth

Cultural, Sport & Community
Expert Panel

- Neighbourhood Development Plans
- CMK Alliance
- Overview CMK Alliance Plan
- MKC Sport & Leisure Strategy
- MKC Public Art Strategy
- Cultural Benchmarks
- CMK Alliance Proposals

The New Planning Landscape

The Existing Planning Framework
- Planning Policy Statements
- Regional Spatial Strategies
- Core Strategy & Other Development Plan Documents
- Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)

The New Planning Framework
- National Planning Policy Framework
- Local Plans / LDFs
- Neighbourhood Development Plans
- Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)
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Overview of Development Strategy

- Strengthening magnets & flows
- Existing and new key pedestrian destinations ('magnets')
- Existing and new pedestrian desire lines ('flowers')

Objectives
1. Increase the draw of station square
   - More office development
   - Major community leisure facility
   - Re-vitalise leisure flows
   - New hotel / conference / exhibition offer
   - Major new office developments in 84 (end of plan period)
2. Expand retail core and diversify the offer
   - New mixed-use developments north of Midsummer Boulevard & east of John Lewis
   - New cultural and community attractions
3. Develop University north of Campbell Park
   - Lecture theatres, student accommodation
4. Deliver Growth during Plan Period
   - Deliver Growth during Plan Period

Overview of Growth during Plan Period

An economic powerhouse

Overview of PROPOSED Sites
for New Cultural, Sport & Community Facilities

Core Strategy vs. CMKAP Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Strategy</th>
<th>CMKAP Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offices (m²)</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151,296 B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>10,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,750 B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (m²)</td>
<td>111,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Fewer dwellings delivered because CMK Alliance Plan switches block 84 use to offices to deliver more jobs versus Core Strategy.
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Overview of ALL Cultural, Sport & Community Facilities
An International Sporting & Cultural City

- Hotel & Conference
- Exhibition Space
- Sport
- Cultural/Hotel mixed-use
- Civic
- University
- Cultural Facility
- Community Facility
- Retail / Culture & Community Mixed-use

* Includes Network Rail

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

MKC Leisure & Sport Strategy 2009-2014
Between 2012 and 2016, or when population reaches 270,000

Facility | What | Where
--- | --- | ---
Pools | 25m x 8 lane & teaching pool | Central MK
Pool refurbishment | Woughton
Leon
Stantonbury

Sports Halls | 1 x 4 court | Hazlezy School
1 x 4 court | New secondary school site within Eastern Expansion Area (EEA) Phase 1
1 x 4 court | New secondary school site within Western Expansion Area (WEA) Phase 2
1 x 4 court | Central or North

Sports Halls | 1 x full size | Oakgrove school
1 x full size | Hazlezy school
1 x full size | New secondary school site in WEA
1 x full size | New secondary school site in EEA

STPs | 1 x training pitch (60 x 40 m) | Central
1 x lane track | Central/South East or link to proposed MK University site

Athletics Track | 1 x 6 lane | North side of Central MK

Between 2017-2021, or when population reaches 290,000

Facility | What | Where
--- | --- | ---
Pools | Aquatic centre linked to university development - diving pool etc. | University site

Sports Halls | 2 x 4 court hall | Location tbc, should meet areas of need including north MK and Newport Pagnell
1 x 6 court hall | University site
1 x full size | University site
1 x outdoor training site(s) | Located on school sites geographically away from existing/ proposed tracks

Outdoor bowls | 1 green | South
1 green | West

Outdoor Tennis | see 2012-2016 | see 2012-2016

Health and fitness | 500 stations | 50% co-located with other public pay and play sports facilities.

Golf | 1 x 18 hole course | 18 driving range bays
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MKC Sport & Leisure Strategy
Dec 2010 Refresh

MKC Int’l Sporting City (ISC)
Nov 2011

MKC Public Arts Strategy
Nov 2010

Cultural Benchmark: Bristol
Culture as Demand of Economic Development

We would suggest that a Cultural Strategy for Bristol should be much more than just an arts plan. It should not be concerned solely with “entertainment” or the production, exhibition and consumption of different art forms. In its widest sense “culture” has increasingly come to be seen as a key component of the quality of life in a city... As cities compete as locations for investment and as spheres of influence, city leaders are discovering how to use culture to make their cities distinctive.
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Cultural Benchmarks: Toronto
Critical Success Factors

A novel attempt to classify and map cultural facilities not just functionally, but in terms of a regional cultural development strategy, has been adopted in the city-region of Toronto, Ontario (Ouston, 2003). In formulating the methodology, a wide spectrum of facilities with very different...

...These 750 facilities were then mapped (colour-coded) by one or a combination of these categories referred to as “multivariate complexes”, in terms of those that are city-owned and independent (20% of the total). As in other cities, facilities are found in clusters and corridors, and are not evenly dispersed across the city. The location of the concentration of the majority of cultural facilities, especially those that were not City-owned, indicated that they benefited from being:
- located in an area that has high pedestrian traffic;
- near an abundance of public transportation;
- near easy access to major highways;
- part of a critical mass of like facilities.

Cultural Benchmark: Vancouver

Vancouver: the challenge of growth

Vancouver has emerged in recent years as "the poster child of utopia in North America". As Lance Brouwer comments, the city has "joined itself into becoming a model of contemporary city-making. Like the most vivid of dreams the city is re-inventing itself..."

Much of this "re-invention" is driven by the scale, speed and diversity of the population growth that's occurring. Between 2001 and 2006 the city's population grew to about 575,000 from 546,500 and CityFac estimates that the population could reach 605,000 - inline with PoP3 targets - by 2011, with possibly 57,000 new dwellings in the downtown.

Vancouver's diverse community

Early more than 100 years old, this is a young city with a young population and growth will continue to be fueled by the immigration which has historically created the integrated ethnically diverse population which is one of the city's distinguishing features. Language is valued of the arts and culture in Vancouver

Home to the highest per capita concentration of artists in Canada, Vancouver has a growing national and international reputation as a culture and creative city. With 1,862 performances and festivals in parks and community centres, 540 live performing arts productions and more than 600 exhibitions in museums and galleries a year it's estimated that about 3 million people attend live arts events every year in the city.

Cultural Benchmark: Vancouver

Population = 3x Milton Keynes

Demand for Small Live Presentation Space

In this study's survey, 66 Theatre, Dance and Music organizations who require live presentation space in the next 15 years identified an overwhelming demand for space under 10,000 sq. ft. (90%).

- Major Performance Space >3,000 seats
- Medium Performance Space ~500 seats
- Small Performance Space <200 seats
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Rebecca Guth, Chair of CMK Alliance outlined the process to date of creating the plan. The business plan was developed to drive the core strategy, the CMK Alliance has accepted the principles set out by the CMK for delivery within the plan. It is important that we are able to identify the magnets and drivers that will deliver CMK and how by working together they will enable prosperity and future development.

An analysis of the undeveloped land in CMK was carried out in line with the delivery principles set out by the strategy. To meet the principles CMK will become much more diverse not only commercially but also by a high density strategy.

The timetable for the plan has been refined with the first week of September setting out when the CMK Alliance is ready to move forward. The plan will be Phase 1 of consultation conducted by MRT reaching the wider community. Consultation would cease at the end of December and a report will be prepared for March 2013.

Following the initial presentation the following comments were made:

- Concern was raised regarding the perceived zoning of development. It was noted that following the workshops in April/May, it became clear that a mixed-use approach was preferred to several allocations of land use. However, mixed-use also posed the issue of achieving the deliverables set through the core strategy. The group wanted to see more input before September to discuss this as it was agreed that to enable a balance to be achieved it needed to be considered.
- One person noted that one of the earlier workshops specifically raised the issue of developing Campbell Park as a cultural hub – this is not reflected in the presentation.
- The facilities noted in the presentation require further input from the Public Art & Libraries Strategies.

Expert Panel Comments

EH: the facilities recognised are a good start and cultural facilities relating to arts and heritage are a pleasing inclusion. However, the plan doesn’t incorporate a museum or visitor centre, and a city centre museum coupled with a visitor centre would have a great benefit. An archive, a cafe and an art gallery in the city centre. Smaller performance areas should also be included along with more exhibition areas.

- EH: While CMK is a set of spaces an unsupported or not “decorated” – it would be in the benefit to find a way to make this happen. The current part could develop sites very well and raise the profile of CMK – Middleton Hall, Midsummer Place, Magpies Court Square, Hub and Campbell Park could do more. The plan has new spaces, but the mechanism to programme them greater emphasises could be placed on parody.
- AL: Is there an opportunity to encourage creative industry to base themselves within CMK? By the health of arts is the provision for artists. Currently, we are losing artists to other areas, we need to enable developments that they can get involved in. An idea of space for makers and creative is CMK – could the Point be turned into a creative and arts-based centre?
- MR: We need to be creative about how we turn our streets. There are a number of strategies that are ambitious, delivery in CMK has slowed down – maybe our focus should be on a big idea rather than a number of smaller approaches. Station Square has great potential. Thomas Heatherwick likened CMK to a piece of public art in progress – why not focus on this and build on HH?
- Animation of Station Square – more hotels & sites, a wow factor
- MR: The Central Library enables a free learning environment with IT support. There is the potential for expansion but also for the service to be located elsewhere.
- LD: What’s missing is a digital arts festival – for example, gaming. Curator space for digital media. An opportunity for creative workshops.
- TD: We’ve become more conscious that there are different levels of activity in CMK. There are these being pushed together in a comprehensive list. The Museum of Oxford collection includes the 16th century collection. There is a way of leveraging the cultural collections elsewhere.
- TS: Unlike other cities we don’t have a variety of unit – vast units can enable opportunities but we need to think out of the box. Important to have a BIG idea and take people with you.
- Value our current furniture – the steel bench is unique to CMK.
- Is there value in re-using the old concepts that made CMK unique?
- A large range of aspirations are reflected in the plan – how do we achieve them? The plan needs to focus on fewer deliverables – ones that make an impact.
- MM: Voluntary sector involvement in CMK needs to be enhanced and continued in CMK. The plan needs to be focused on the core – what does it need to do? The answer probably is about participation and bringing people together.
- PC: Spaces – there is good coverage of ideas reflected through thorough wide strategies. We shouldn’t be too restrictive but reflective of future needs. We need to consider future-proofing – for example, is there a library service in the future?
- KS: The gallery and theatre expansion will provide a link to the park and exciting additions to CMK, including educational programmes.

Contributors:

- The plan needs to achieve short, medium and long-term goals over a number of years with activities embedded around the goals. There is no recognition of economic climate and the role of business, this needs to be contextualised.
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- CMK and wider Milton Keynes need to be looked at together. In fact, one suggestion is that we need to look regionally – we need to consider creating a regional attraction.
- Free activities important to bring people to the centre, places like the Busy Skate Park and youth facilitics.
- The plan should not prevent the unusual from happening, it should be flexible. Everything is doable but it needs to be funded.
- But the point of a plan is to bring a focus that allows us to achieve things we couldn’t without a plan – how else can we get the critical mass of footprint and clustering that was highlighted as important?
- We need to understand the viability of project against commercial reality.
- Particular developments enabled other opportunities e.g. Kingston Tesco development enabled the creation of the Gymnastics Centre. Are these enabling/delivery mechanisms still available?
- Financial implications - vibrant culture is important to businesses, employees want retail space, green spaces and a vibrant city centre with culture.
- The plan should provide the bringing together of ideas and show what is possible if funding was available – it needs to provide a framework.
- What are the anchors for CMK – CMK train station / bus stops – we need to maintain the flexibility for connectivity and opportunities to be unique.
- Nervousness regarding commercial deliverability - the plan should reflect deliverability against commercial reality.
- Predicting what’s needed in the future isn’t possible – we need to enable flexibility.
- The plans has too many ‘don’t’ to be deliverable – too much aspiration in one go. What are the really key things – what we must focus on?
- We need a few hirats, close, intuitive clustering.
- More specific input is needed on what can make the plan more deliverable – need to realise our must haves for the future and be realistic about what is truly possible.
- Expectations need to be closely managed as the plan progresses.
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AGENDA

17.00 1. Welcome & Introductions

17.10 2. Overview of Proposals for Parking & Public Transportation
   ✓ A short presentation on current proposals and background papers

17.20 3. Topic 2: The future and wider context
   ✓ Expert Panel 20 min
   ✓ What is the future of public transportation in Milton Keynes? Is it really large vehicles, small vehicles or mass rapid transit?
   ✓ In 2050, how will bus services in Milton Keynes operate differently from what we have today?
   ✓ Do the panel feel there would be advantages in Milton Keynes having greater control over public transport provision by adopting similar powers to London?
   ✓ Q&A with Contributors (10 min)

* paper to follow
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CMK Growth assumptions to 2031 from a base of 2003
(incl Campbell Park) and key planning parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional to 2003 base</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2026 Core Strategy</th>
<th>2026 CMK NDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base 2003</strong></td>
<td><strong>2013</strong></td>
<td><strong>LP &amp; 2001 CMK NDP</strong></td>
<td><strong>2026 Core Strategy</strong></td>
<td><strong>2026 CMK NDP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>280,000 m²</td>
<td>445,000 m²</td>
<td>180,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>280,000 m²</td>
<td>105,000 m² and leisure</td>
<td>110,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1,200 dwellings</td>
<td>6,400 dwellings</td>
<td>5,000 dwellings (assuming 1,400 built since 2003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Hotels and other</td>
<td>New hotels and other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 hotels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Car parking**

There are currently around 24,000 non-residential car parking spaces serving CMK comprising 20,000 public and 4,000 private non-residential parking spaces. In addition there are a further 5,000 out-commuting spaces at the station. In order to bring parking levels in line with the requirements of PPG 13, CMK has the most restricted new car parking standards for the whole of MK, on the basis that CMK enjoys good public transport. An exercise undertaken at the time of the Local Plan indicated that by applying the Council’s new car parking standards, to all future growth development, re-development in CMK, the total number of spaces would increase to around 31,000, of which some 3,000 would be required to support the development of the currently largely undeveloped Campbell Park. This leaves only around a further 3,000 spaces to support the expansion of the rest of CMK. In addition to these 31,000 spaces will be the on-plot private residential spaces, which will total around a further 7,000 to 8,000 spaces, based on the housing projections.

**Buses**

Around 88 buses per hour use Station Square in the morning peak 8am to 9am period. All traverse along Midsummer Boulevard, stopping every 400 metres to serve each development block. Station Square has been redeveloped to be able to accommodate 144 peak hour bus movements. For this number of buses to continue to use Midsummer Boulevard, the 4 bus stopping areas would each have to be totally reconfigured to replicate the capacity now being provided in Station Square. If this was to be carried out, Midsummer Boulevard would lose most of its London Plane trees and become one long continuous bus station. During the 7.00am to 9.00am morning peak, the around 240 bus movements bring in some 3,400 workers into CMK.

**Walking and cycling**

During the same 7.00am to 9.00am morning peak, typically around 2,000 people walk into CMK and 500 cycle.

**Visitor numbers**

On a typical day CMK has around 100,000 visitors. To support the amount of development contained in the Core Strategy, the number of visitors will increase to around 150,000 people per day, with peaks demand rising toward 200,000.

**Other key planning parameters**

- **Offices**
  - 1 job per 32 m² net floor area or 15 m² gross (for example, Network Rail HQ with net floor space of 35,582 m² providing 2,000 jobs).
  - Previous CMK office parking standard 1 space per 32 m² gross
  - Current CMK office parking standard 1 space per 75 m² gross (or 50 m² gross for Campbell Park) – or approximately 1 parking space for every 4.5 new jobs.

- **Retail**
  - The Bluewater shopping mall in Kent has a gross floor area of 155,000 m², provides 13,000 car parking spaces and creates around 6,000 jobs, which equates to approximately 1 space per 50 m² gross.
  - Previous CMK retail parking standard 1 space per 18 m² gross.
  - Current CMK retail parking standard 1 space per 44 m² gross for food and 1 space per 66 m² gross for non-food.
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**Transport Strategy Review Study March 2007 – Core Strategy Update**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source document</th>
<th>Transport Strategy Review</th>
<th>Core Strategy</th>
<th>Year 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>31,000 sps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining car or van</td>
<td>18,718 (70.1%)</td>
<td>23,260 (46.5%)</td>
<td>17,350 (28.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger in car or van</td>
<td>2,736 (10.2%)</td>
<td>5,850 (11.7%)</td>
<td>3,866 (5.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(average car occupancy)</td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td>(1.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus (Public Transport)</td>
<td>2,315 (8.7%)</td>
<td>9,671 (19.2%)</td>
<td>14,152 (21.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2,500 (5.0%)</td>
<td>2,115 (4.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>575 (2.2%)</td>
<td>1,077 (2.2%)</td>
<td>990 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>200 (0.7%)</td>
<td>374 (0.7%)</td>
<td>315 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>1,474 (5.5%)</td>
<td>5,000 (10.0%)</td>
<td>4,227 (6.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>450 (1.8%)</td>
<td>1,750 (3.5%)</td>
<td>1,485 (2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (incl. motorcycle)</td>
<td>200 (0.8%)</td>
<td>380 (0.8%)</td>
<td>360 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Journeys to Work</td>
<td>29,669 (100.0%)</td>
<td>50,000 (100.0%)</td>
<td>45,000 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. The original Table 11 only considered journey to work trips.
2. The 2020 Core Strategy derivation column recalculates the mode of journey to work, based on the premise that an appropriate amount of the total publicly available car parking spaces in CMK needs to be reserved, in the form of shorter stay parking, for visitors to the retail and entertainment facilities (primarily shoppers who will of course arrive after the workers, later in the day) and office visitors thereby reducing significantly the amount of long stay (worker) parking.
3. The required visitor provision has been calculated on the basis of 1 space per 30 m² gross floor area for retail and 1 space per 900 m² gross floor area for office development. For the purpose of this exercise no allowance has been made for entertainment land uses. By 2026 total retail provision of 320,000 m² is forecast requiring 10,670 shorter stay spaces and 600,000 m² of offices requiring a further 2,600 shorter stay visitor car parking making a total of 13,270 shorter stay car parking spaces.
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Overview of Parking & Public Transportation Plan

5th July 2012
Expert Panel Session
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Overview of Parking & Public Transportation Plan

Work-in-progress

CMK Alliance Plan

Vision

In 2026, CMK will be the dynamic centre of one of the fastest-growing regions in the south east. It will support thousands of new jobs and wide-spread prosperity:

- A world-class city centre in the UK, pioneering sustainable and convenient transportation for workers, visitors and residents.
- The home of an expanding university, delivering innovation approaches in higher education and creating new ventures in technological and creative hubs across the city.
- A vibrant and safe place, that we love, for families and diverse users, visitors and residents alike, with open access to shopping, leisure, sport, arts, culture and social facilities, offering an exciting choice of life and leisure options.
- An admired, prestigious city centre, embedding the distinctive ‘Milanese Kerassia’ character and vibrancy for future generations.

CMK Alliance Plan

Project Timelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>CMK Alliance</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of Growth during Plan Period

Delivering the Core Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Strategy</th>
<th>CMKAP Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office (m²)</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>10,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,750 B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (m²)</td>
<td>111,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Fewer dwellings delivered because CMK Alliance Plan changes Black B4 in office to deliver more jobs versus Core Strategy.
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**Objectives**

1. Increase the draw of station square
   - More office developments
   - Major community leisure facility
   - New mixed-use developments south of Midsummer Blvd & east of John Lewis’
   - New cultural and community attractions

2. Develop University north of Campbell Park
   - Lecture theatres, student accommodation

3. Expand retail core and diversify the offer
   - New mixed-use developments south of Midsummer Blvd & east of John Lewis’
   - New cultural and community attractions

4. Major new office developments in B4 (end of Plan period)
   - Lecture theatres, student accommodation

**CMK Alliance Parking & Public Transport**

**Key Challenges**

1. Anticipating and managing over-loading of movement network
   - Accessibility is CMK’s key competitive advantage
   - Original plan designed CMK for a city of 250,000 – MK is now approaching this population and is projected to reach 300,000 by the end of the plan period
   - Significant intensification of number of workers, visitors and residents in CMK

2. Identifying a viable transition strategy
   - Chicken-and-egg problem – need high levels of patronage to make quality public transport financially viable, but many most car users won’t switch until there is quality public transport in the first place
   - Political and public sector financial risks in subsidising public transport – how to get people out of their cars? How long and how much?
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Overview of LTP3 Strategy for CMK
(Draft illustration from revised CMK Development Framework)

CMK Alliance Parking & Public Transport

Objectives

1. Employees commuting by car (office/retail/leisure employees)
   - Short-term: shift all-day parking to the edges of CMK
   - Long-term: shift substantial numbers to Public Transport

2. Business visitors & employees needing to make intra-day business journeys by car
   - Short-term: modify car parking management charging scheme to ensure CMK is attractive to professional businesses needing this type of parking flexibility
   - Long-term: maximise operational parking for business visitors and employees who need to make multiple business journeys during the day by car

3. Retail and leisure visitors (shoppers, commercial & community leisure)
   - Short-term: optimise use of existing parking by better distributing visitor parking across CMK
   - Long-term: shift more visitors from the urban M101a Keyways area to Public Transport

4. CMK/Campbell Park Residents
   - Short-term: maintain current (reduced) parking standards but look to possibly provide some additional car parking nearby (e.g. on undeveloped or underdeveloped land in Campbell Park) until Shuttle / DART up and running
   - Long-term: remove this additional parking (via development of the land) as better public transport becomes available

CMK Alliance Parking & Public Transport

Long-term Vision

1. Advanced mass rapid transit through major transport corridors
   - East-West mass rapid transit along Midsummer Blvd connecting Station to Coachway and beyond (e.g. Cranfield University)
     - System is planned through Midsummer Place to maintain easy pedestrian (shopper) movement at ground level
   - North-South mass rapid transit line from Bletchley to Wolverton (lines cross at CMK train station), connecting the Stadium and the Bowl with CMK

2. Shuttle or Demand-Responsive Transit as local services
   - Use ‘feeder’ system locally to move people within CMK and onto mass rapid transit at stations
   - Frequent ‘shuttle’ service (shopper) proposed in LTP3 circuiting on Avebury and Stilbury Blvds between Station and Campbell Park
   - Alternatively, demand responsive, door-to-door mini-bus/multi-call service (Dial-a-Ride-Transit or DART) could be feeder service

CMK Alliance Parking & Public Transport

Transition Strategy

Next 2-5 years:

1. Develop Shuttle / DART service plus temporary CMK Park & Ride facilities
   - Start shifting local (Milton Keynes) retail/office visitors to parking further away from retail core and using Shuttle / DART
   - Start shifting 5% workers to all-day parking at temporary Park & Ride on edges of CMK & using Shuttle or DART
   - Build patronage for Shuttle / DART
   - Parking charges and Park & Ride charges must be structured to encourage use of Shuttle/DART and the Park & Ride facilities

2. Create Public Transport Interchange in Retail Core
   - MK Star services would stop at both the Station and Retail Core, but not at bus stops in between
   - Bus users can transfer at Interchanges to Shuttle / DART for other destinations within CMK
   - Build patronage for Shuttle / DART
   - 2nd interchange is more convenient for bus users than just one at Station Square – it’s about finding the right balance between convenience for users of transferring to Shuttle / DART and quicker transit journeys for other users as a result of fewer stops within CMK

3. Conduct feasibility work for mass rapid transit system
   - Identify best system and establish business case
   - Reserve corridor and station points for future expansion

*by ‘temporarily’ we mean a reasonably short period of time (e.g. provided by a partnership and pledged funds)
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**Retail Core Interchange**
Co-located with New Market Hall?

- Indoor seating area & toilets
- MTR
- Gates & market stalls

**CMK Alliance Parking & Public Transport**

**Long-Term Strategy**

**By 2023:**
- Complete construction of first 'leg' from station to retail core of mass rapid transit system
  - Continue to use CMK Park & Ride facilities and M&K, Staff and Shuttle DART services during construction phase

**By 2026:**
- Complete construction of second 'leg' from retail core to north side of Campbell Park (site Tbd)
  - Switch Park & Ride users to mass rapid transit system—continue to provide parking nearby
  - Transition to large office developments north of the Park to generate further patronage
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CMK Alliance Parking & Public Transport
Long-Term Vision (3): Personal Rapid Transit (PRT)

CMK Alliance Parking & Public Transport
Emerging Parking Policy

1. Principles
   - Car parking provision in CMK must serve to maintain the economic viability of Central Milton Keynes as a place to work, visit and live.
   - Parking management must also be used as an important and necessary tool to promote a shift to more sustainable modes of transport.

2. Objectives for CMK Parking Charges / Schemes
   - Parking charges / schemes will be structured to optimise use of existing parking spaces and to support public transport.
   - Parking charges / schemes will be implemented to maximise availability of alternative (inter-day) parking spaces for businesses by shifting all day parking away from the Business District during weekdays.
   - Parking charges / schemes will be implemented to maximise the rate and tenure of visits to parking outside of the Retail Core during weekends.
   - An expanded Variable Message System (VMS) will be implemented across CMK to direct private car users to appropriate parking spaces on weekdays and weekends.

CMK Alliance Parking & Public Transport
Emerging Parking Policy

3. Policies for CMK Parking Provision – General Policies
   - Surface level parking around retail is an important public resource that will be retained for current and future public benefit. These parking spaces will be managed by CMK’s parking changes / schemes. Businesses and other users of public transport – such as cycle retailers, pedal electric operators (shared hire vehicles), and visitor attractions, for example.
   - Surface level perimeter parking spaces and VMS are one of CMK’s original design principles and contribute significantly to CMK’s unique character and overall brand identity.

4. Policies for CMK Parking Provision – Business District
   - On-street parking provision for new office developments and re-generation of existing office stock will be driven by market needs, e.g., developers may provide as much or as little on-street parking as necessary to meet current market demand for parking amenity for that type of development.
   - Except for small quantities of parking, on-street parking must be provided with an underground (basement) or multi-storey car parks within the development lot.
   - For large developments, parking must be designed for dual private-public use – private use during weekdays 9-5 for the development, public use during all weekend.
   - Parking obligations based on amount of parking provided will be used to fund public transport in CMK - specifically a new interchange in the retail core, temporary park & ride facilities, and VMS. (Note: obligations per parking space will use a marginal, step rate, charging rate approach).
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5. Policies for CMK Parking Provision – Retail Core Area and Station District
   - Parking provision will be made in accordance with the CMK Alliance Land Use Plan and site-specific policies.

   - On-street parking provision for new developments or regeneration of older properties will be provided largely in accordance with existing CMK residential parking standards (TBD).

7. Policies for CMK Parking Provision – Other Areas
   - On-street parking provision for new mixed-use developments or regeneration of existing buildings in other areas must meet residential requirements (above)...
   - TBD: specific requirements for leisure use, convenience retail outside of the Retail Core (e.g., supermarkets), other uses classes...
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NC: A rapid transport approach won’t be delivered in the next 10 years. The drawbacks of this are that it is inflexible. We don’t know what the future holds so needs to be flexible to adapt. Allowing flexibility without the fixed costs of infrastructure.

JB: Smaller vehicles would give the flexibility of a private car without having to make car parking spaces for them. If they are multiple occupancy then it would pay for itself.

JW: In terms of public transport, the whole borough needs to be looked at, all as these areas have different needs. We need to talk about the different needs that can be met by public transportation – some are social needs, others are environmental needs, etc. Public transportation can also be an ‘attractor’ – the city centre could have a high profile, attractive, ‘novel’ transport system with other methods serving the rest of the borough. It may not make economic sense on its own, but people will find it attractive, and it could raise MK’s profile as a ‘forward thinking city’ and attract new businesses.

A town system costs £100m per mile. Why not put this towards the bus system? (It was noted that the costs in CMK for this could be less due to the infrastructure already in place).

Do the panel feel there would be advantages in MK having greater control over public transport provision by adopting similar powers to London?

The panel were in a resounding agreement that yes, to have a public passenger authority managing the overall network (but outsourcing delivery to private bus companies) would be a great advantage.

Since public transportation was deregulated in the 80’s, bus usage in the UK has fallen 50%, except in London, which retained its Transport Authority and bus usage has increased by 50%.

Fares/durations/routes are critical to the public but it is all set by the bus operators in MK.

Deregulation was a disaster – Regulation would be a strong factor for MK to move forward and have commercially led routes that the local authority could fill in the gaps afterwards.

Need to draw a contract between operations and capital investment powers. Managing bus timetings – yes. Owning the buses themselves – no.

Need a quality contract.

Have powers started to devolve to Metropolitan cities now have them and the Government is talking about a second wave.

Through-ticketing should be implemented so any bus ticket could also be used on a city-centre shuttle.

Should SAVELP consider applying to be a Passenger Authority for the region?

Topic 2 – CMK Car Parking

Should there be an overall parking provision increase in relation to new development or should there be a cap on parking in CMK and journeys satisfied by other means?

JB: we want more businesses to stay in CMK, more inward investment, visitors and residents therefore we need to give them the choice of coming here it suits them best, which is usually by the car. CMK does not need to offer more car parking spaces.
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- NY: We need to be wary of using car parking provision as a tool for modal shift. Pedestrians will find elsewhere to park no matter what, e.g., residential areas and central reservations as they have in the past. Parking restrictions have to come with an alternative.
- WP: Requirements in car parking are inexorably linked with future public transport systems and we have to be realistic about the modal shift to expect. In the Core Strategy the proposed percentage of people that will use public transport is not realistic. Realistic views of public transport are lower than estimated. Car parking has to be offered and standards relaxed, in physical terms having Multi-story car parks accessible to the grid roads is the answer.
- Me: Parking and Multi-Story Car parks (MSCP) have to be thought about in terms of the grid road network serving CMK. There are approx. 15,000 cars coming into the city at rush hour - any more beyond this will need additional management on the junctions. The MSCP that was looked at to be located behind John Lewis was designed to hold 2,000 cars with access off of Marlborough grid road. Research showed that at 5pm full, the discharge rate would be done to empty. There are big implications of putting these car parks on the surrounding areas. Need to look at the holistic approach and the knock on effect.
- JF: Then shouldn’t the same issue apply to Park & Ride? How do we manage 9-5 rush hours in and out of the Park & Ride facilities? Surely the ‘discharge’ problems apply equally to Park & Ride as to MSCPs.
- Me: Parking policies are needed to make certain areas attractive to shift times of usage - peak/off-peak times. For example, one could make parking charges cheaper in an MSCP before and after peak periods, in order to encourage spreading of arrival/leave.
- MB: The transport strategy review in 2007 stated the network had 25% capacity available in peak times. This was 5 years ago so we must be reaching this capacity. We do need parking controls to aid modal shift.
- To discourage car users, public transport should be fantastic!
- AF: Cost is a huge influence of using the car versus public transport. Thinner parking and parking charges can be used to aid modal shift.
- NY: Not saying it isn’t useful, but don’t rely heavily on controlling parking amount and parking charges to achieve modal shift to public transportation.
- AF: CMK has 4 times as many car parking spaces than other areas its size at ½ of the cost and ¼ of the amount of buses, if car parking costs were increased, it would increase public transport use.
- AT: 31,000 car parking spaces in the Local Plan, 25% more than now. This all connects to the grid road capacity.
- A solution could be to park on the perimeters of the city centre and then get a bus or a tram in! It was also commented that it would be even more economical to get a bus all the way from your home - although 60% of the CMK large employers workforce live outside the borough.
- A highly attractive bus service on the vertical routes.
- JB: The 4 roundabouts leading into the city centre are the points of peak hour. The issue is backing up from the gates. If you don’t force all the traffic up the gates you wouldn’t have a problem. If the MSCP’s were accessible off the grid roads this would take the pressure off the gates.
- Something would be needed to encourage people to park on the urban edge and then to use a bus into the centre – employees passes?
- Businesses have a culture of fixed start/end times that contribute to peak hour congestion. If peak hour was spread this would ease the problem.
- MB: There is 25% maximum additional capacity available at junctions - having grade separation or traffic lights would increase this percentage but is not deliverable due to funding, environmental aspects and that some roundabouts would not be suitable. MK has grown with public networks so the public would not be happy. With the capacity needed, roundabouts would require a full lane approach which is a huge project. People don’t like the Grafton/Sibbly junction although it is working a lot better.
- AT: There needs to be reclassification of existing car parks. There are 18,000 off grade car parks at present; if this is being increased to 31,000 then the 13,000 additional will have to go in MSCP’s. Should workers fill these leaving the closer spaces for visitors? This would mean that the MSCP’s would be filled and discharged at the same time. It needs to be modeled accurately.
- CF: The reality is that we cannot afford these MSCP aspirations. At £15,000 per space it is not deliverable. S106, CIL, and the tariff were fine historically but now not economically deliverable. Public transport does not become regulated then AltaVista remains the key player. A strategic discussion is needed of how it will be delivered. The balance of providing a good public transport system with the pressure of parking cars is very delicate. How to balance the cost also needs to be worked up in the plan.
- AT: Vehicle occupancy of each car parked in CMK is 1.15 – 20 cars bring in 23 people, it is grossly undersized. What other ways to move more people in by car sharing?

Is there a benefit of using vacant land as temporary car parks?

- It should be something to explore if MSCP’s are not the viable option.
- ST: Temporary car parks need to be done well, good design and managed so not to put off visitors coming into the city.
- Changing behaviour is not easy. People would get used to having a car park in a location then it would change again.
- MF: MK is a transitional city so needs to be able to adapt as necessary.
- If an offer comes in for a site that a car park is on then it needs to be able to vacate quickly.
- JB: If something doesn’t fit in CMK then it shouldn’t be chained to the city centre if it would be better elsewhere. CMK should be the retail and business core but other aspects like a university, museums and more residential should be located elsewhere in the borough. Valuable MSCP space allocated for residential uses does not add up.
Expert Panel 2: Parking and Public Transport (Outputs)

**Topic 3 – Public Transport**

Would the panel see a benefit of providing a multi-modal interchange in the retail core (with crosscity buses stopping at both the station and retail core), and taking buses off Midsummer Boulevard (if it allow the envisaged enhancement of what is described as prime public realm)?

- There are 48 buses each way per hour along Midsummer Boulevard with 5 current stops; is it economically viable to have a shuttle system as well as 100 buses going along this route?
- All taking out the stops on Midsummer would not be popular with the bus users. People don’t like interchanges – they introduce delays and uncertainty and puts approx 30% of people off using a route.
- At: Most people use buses to get into CMK, not to pass through it so taking out stops would be unpopular. There are many services that could stop at the 2 main interchanges at the retail core and station, but local services need to be stopping every few hundred meters.
- Cr: There is a limit to how far the land use is in the plan. The assumptions made in the Core Strategy are a bit wrong – by 2039, there will not have been 1.8 million sqft of business space created in CMK – in the last 10 years only 400,000 sqft has been built in the form of the Pinnacle and Northill Mall. In terms of transport, we are making assumptions that these figures are correct but we need to be realistic. Where is the absolute mandate that we want to increase density in CMK?
- JH: The Core Strategy is currently in public examination by MG. If we don’t agree with the figures, it should be sold so we need to build on the assumption we feel are realistic. (It was noted that legislation says that a Business Neighborhood Plan does have to comply with the Core Strategy).
- WP: CMK already has massive amounts of additional development than what was in the original master plan. The grid is designed to be able to disperse development – from a transport perspective: do you want this additional infrastructure? Caution against over-heating CMK.
- WP: Avelbury/Sibury should be left for cars, keeping public transport along Midsummer.
- CMK is at breaking point in terms of transport. The existing transport system would like CMK to stay the same – don’t besmirch it.
- Interchanges are fine if you want to get from Whistler to Bletchley but people don’t want it getting from the station to Civic!

**Parking thoughts:**

- JH: We need flexibility but without a big fixed infrastructure – the key is flexibility and need to adapt to changing needs.
- HH: Don’t build and solve transport afterwards – put transport right in the heart.
- WP: Caution against abandoning cross city buses stopping along MBE – better to get cars on Sibury and Avelbury and leave MBE for buses. He likes conceptually the Brenn-Car paper – CMK as good as any other place to try it.
- JB: Supportive of keeping buses on MBE. But issues we are facing are self-inflicted by a desire to significantly increase the density of CMK, so we are coming to our bus.
- AF: This is why we need lots more public transport – if we can’t come in by car, then must massively increase bus usage.
- AT: If we don’t agree with the increased density of CMK, we still have to put the jobs somewhere – there’s very little employment land in the expansion areas, so people will have to travel somewhere to work. And distributing jobs to other areas will not be a solution either – it will also lead to congestion of the neighbouring grid roads and junctions in those areas, too.
1. STRATEGIC CONTEXT

1.1 The Problem

The land-use and transportation plans for MK have already evolved into something of a “miasma”. The original 1960’s Master Plan for all its faults of creating unrealistic expectations of a high quality public transport service on the one hand, yet providing a difficult public transport operating environment on the other, nevertheless had the merit of consistency when it came to the primary citywide transport mode – the private car. The dispersed pattern of low density land uses, combined with the network of grid roads was ideal for the motor car – indeed it positively encouraged car use and a ‘car culture’, a legacy which is still ‘alive and kicking’ today.

A crucial component of that integrated land-use/transportation plan was a ‘cap’ on the size of CMK and in particular the proportion of citywide jobs that were located in CMK. This meant that travel demand patterns were dispersed citywide with only a modest focus on trips in and from the centre, with the result that the city could function up to its planned 250,000 population with a relatively congested free road network.

The reality is already very different. Whilst the city’s long-term development plans now see a population approaching 300,000 – 20% above Master Plan the unfettered development of CMK has already seen the proportion of citywide jobs based in CMK increase dramatically and that trend is set to continue into the future (Master Plan 15-20,000 jobs in CMK, current planning 25,000, i.e. a 4 times increase). The resultant shift in travel patterns from dispersal towards more radial travel to/from CMK sits uncomfortably with the grid road network. It is thus unsurprising that the onset of traffic congestion in and immediately around CMK has already arrived, and that this is forecast to get much worse in the coming years. (The author does not wish to deny the unbridled benefits and perhaps economic impetus of the intensification of development of CMK, but simply to point out the incompatibility with the city’s transport network).

1.2 Currently Proposed Solution

There are 3 potential components to a strategy for addressing the problems of travel to/from CMK:

A. Lower the growth targets for CMK, or at least the planned pace of growth to enable improvements in transport provision to ‘catch up’.
B. Increase the capacity of the road network to get more traffic into and out of CMK and increase car park provision.
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C. Shift modal split away from the car towards other modes primarily public transport.

The ‘Core Strategy’ appears to rely on component C only. It is acknowledged that the ‘required modal shift’ figures for work journeys into CMK shown in the 2007 Core Strategy Update, and those in the partial Transport Strategy Review, (i.e. reducing car drivers from 70% to somewhere in the range of 25%-45%) would if achieved largely address the problem of peak travel into CMK. However, there remains a fundamental question of whether this degree of modal shift, or anything approaching it, is deliverable over the 15-20 year timescale envisaged (or even beyond). In particular public transport (e.g. park & ride and rail) would need to increase its share of trips from 10% now to somewhere in the range 20%-50%, which allowing for development means a 4 to 8 fold increase in trip numbers from 2500 to somewhere in the 10,000 to 20,000 range.

1.3 Ability to Deliver Required Modal Shift

To deliver such a substantial modal shift will require both:

a. restricted parking availability and use of the parking price mechanism to ‘force’ commuters onto public transport and other modes.

b. radical improvements in the citywide public transport offer making it an attractive alternative for car drivers.

In this authors view neither of the above are deliverable. The extent of parking restraint required is likely to be unacceptable to the business community and investors, and will not be politically deliverable.

Furthermore, whilst continuing improvements in citywide public transport can reasonably be anticipated, these are likely to be gradual and modest in nature falling far short of the necessary radical upgrade required to effect significant modal shift.

1.4 Alternative Strategy Components

It is likely in this writers view that a significant contribution will be required from all 3 components A-C in 1.2 above if effective travel to/from CMK is to be sustained going forward. This means that:

A. Some lowering of the long-term planned commercial and retail development intensity of CMK (incl. Campbell Park) is desirable as is a softening in the pace of development.

B. Highway and parking capacities will need enhancing.

C. Public transport will still require substantial improvement.

In section 2 and 3 below the transport implications of B and C above on future CMK are explored.

2. CMK PUBLIC TRANSPORT FUTURE

2.1 City-wide Buses

Even within a more balanced and realistic strategic approach as advocated in 1.4 above, with more modest modal shift targets, the citywide public transport network will still be required to attract many more passengers compared to today. For example even shifting peak modal split into CMK from 10% into the 15-20% range (vs 30-50% Core Strategy) implies a doubling and quadrupling of public transport passengers traveling to CMK (from around 2500 to 5-10,000).

This is already an ambitious and challenging task and will require further investment and other support measures if success is to be achieved. Every opportunity to reinforce public transport must be taken. All of the improvements already being implemented and in the pipeline (incl. more comfortable vehicles, faster services with priority, better waiting environment, enhanced information etc) will be required - but conventional routes will remain the primary public transport system city-wide (see also 4.2 Mass Rapid Transit).

2.2 City Buses Within CMK

The present strategy sees all city bus services traversing CMK along the full length of Midsummer Boulevard between Station Square and Marlborough Gate, albeit with a diversion around Midsummer Place. This strategy brings the whole of CMK within approximately 400m maximum walk of all the main city core services, provides interchange opportunities between services, is easy for passengers to understand and use, and is efficient operationally (although somewhat compromised by the Midsummer Place detour).

The evolving Alliance proposals explore alternatives of either routing citywide buses via the outer Business Area (Avocet and Silbury Islands) instead of Midsummer, or providing a second bus interchange (in addition to Station Square) in the retail core off Secklow Gate and routing citywide services through CMK north-south via Vic Griffin Gate and the Station Square interchange and others via Secklow Gate and a new Secklow Gate interchange. This latter proposal would also see a ‘secondary’ CMK ‘distributor’ small bus service operating within CMK (‘Hopper’) enabling passengers to interchange to access other parts of CMK (see also Secondary Service 2.5 below).
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I can only see either of these alternatives being detrimental to citywide bus services, which would clearly be in conflict with the key strategic objectives of improving access to CMK. In the ‘twin’ Boulevard strategy, both outer Boulevards already play essential roles in distributing traffic entering CMK on the Gates, into the car parking blocks and vice-versa, and this role will increase as CMK develops. Mixing buses with ‘turning’ traffic is a bad idea, and will slow services down as well as being hazardous. Midsummer Boulevard handles less turning traffic – indeed virtually all parking can be accessed off the Gates and outer Boulevards, opening up the potential for Midsummer Boulevard to become a space reserved for buses, pedestrians and ‘authorised vehicles’ only which this writer would advocate. Also the ‘twin Boulevard’ bus routing approach would result in not all services being within reasonable walking distance of all CMK developments, and would also be more difficult for users to understand and use.

The alternative ‘twin interchange’ approach puts a greater priority on getting citywide buses through CMK, more quickly at the cost of many people having to interchange onto a secondary distribution system to reach their final destination in CMK. It is already well known that ‘off highway’ interchanges inevitably slow bus services down, and this combined with the fact that the Gates the bus services would use under this approach are the busiest trafficked roads in CMK, being the main entry/exit routes, lead this author to question whether any time gain for cross city buses would be in practice materialise. Furthermore, most passengers on buses entering/leaving CMK are traveling to/from CMK – only a minority are traveling through. Putting a priority on that minority and ‘forcing’ the majority to interchange or walk further to their destination in CMK seems illogical.

It is acknowledged that removing buses from Midsummer Boulevard could create opportunities to enhance the public realm and pedestrian environment – perhaps the underlying motivation behind the alternative bus routing strategies outlined? However, given the overriding need to support and improve public transport there is firstly no alternative available to the current Midsummer Boulevard bus route that is consistent with the wider transport objectives.

Surely a better approach would be to look creatively at how in the longer term the environment on Midsummer can be improved with public transport in mind – and in this context the removal of cars and the introduction of low emission/zero emission (hybrid) buses could merit further study. Such moves could create design opportunities along Midsummer Boulevard whereby public transport can be enhanced without unacceptable compromise to the ‘public realm’.

2.3 Midsummer Place

It follows from the above that if the opportunity to reintroduce a citywide public transport through Midsummer Place could be seized then it should be taken – the unfortunate diversion via lower 9th Street, Avebury Boulevard and Saxon Gate is already ‘costly’ in delays to public transport and this situation can only get worse particularly with the Saxon Gate/Avebury Boulevard junction, which buses must negotiate, being one of the busiest in CMK.

Whilst the prospect of ‘dirty’ diesel powered buses in Midsummer Place may be unrealistic, perhaps low emission or zero emission hybrid buses may be a reasonable future aim, particularly if grade separation with pedestrians can be achieved. It is understood that planning conditions attached to the Midsummer Place development recognize this possibility. It may also be that this prospect can be used as ‘leverage’ for a future bus fleet upgrade.

2.4 Institutional Framework

The present deregulated public transport marketplace mitigates against the co-ordinated planning of urban bus services and is financially inefficient in its reliance on Local Authority resources to ‘plug the gaps’ in the commercial route network. A Public Authority specific network operated by private operators via tendered contracts would in this writer’s view provide a more coherent and cost-effective bus system in MK.

There may be some opportunities of moving in this direction within current legislation (i.e. via ‘Quality Contracts’) although new powers similar to those applying in London may be required. The key point is that moves in this direction can potentially be a ‘game changer’ in achieving the longer term objectives for public transport in MK and should therefore be thoroughly explored as a matter of priority and pursued with vigour.

2.5 Secondary Bus Services and other contributions

There is a range of ‘secondary’ bus services that could be considered that would augment and reinforce the primary bus network, some of which are already included in the Core Strategy and/or the Alliances emerging Parking and Public Transport Plan. Those favoured by this writer are:

- A CMK ‘small bus’ ‘Hopper’ service linking developments within CMK, including parking and extending into Campbell Park.
- A ‘Central Area’ small bus service linking housing areas immediately surrounding CMK with the centre, possibly incorporating a ‘demand responsive’ element.
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It may be that the two could be combined. These are not likely to be commercial, and would need careful planning to ensure that they complemented rather than competed with the primary Citywide bus network.

There are a series of other elements to the overall transport strategy which can all contribute to the requirements to shift modal split away from car drivers. These include:

- Park and ride
- Car share and car club schemes
- Taxis and private hire cars
- Cycle

All of the above have important roles to play in contributing towards delivering the required modal shift, and in combination their contribution becomes substantial. However, individually these secondary bus services and other contributors' have fairly modest impacts on the overall picture. While this in some detracts from their importance, and effort needs to be put into all of them, it will remain the case that by far the most significant contribution in strategic terms to shifting modal split for trips into CMK will have to come from the primary citywide bus network, as illustrated in the Core Strategy Update and Transport Strategy Figures.

3. PARKING AND HIGHWAYS

3.1 Parking Provision

An inevitable consequence of the 3 pronged strategy which this author sees as essential if good movement and access to and within CMK is to be maintained, is the provision of some additional parking. It is beyond the scope of this non-technical overview to be specific regarding numbers, but given the anticipated struggle facing public transport to attract even the more modest switch from car commuters into buses advocated above, a relaxation of future parking standards is likely to be required resulting in a significant additional provision of parking spaces. It should be stressed that successful implementation of the ‘balanced’ strategy advocated will require extremely careful phasing of this additional parking provision – too much too soon can undermine public transport improvements whilst too little too late can undermine the CMK economy and deter investors.

This additional parking provision is seen as a combination of 2 types:
- Peripheral multi-story parking accessed off the outer Gates and/or peripheral grid roads (B5, B6, V8).
- Ground level 'on plot' parking within CMK and Campbell Park (some temporary).

Both these forms of parking can be served by the proposed ‘Elevator’ secondary bus service, which is likely to be needed in order to maintain acceptable accessibility between parking and development i.e. to augment walking as the main mode connecting development with car parks. (It is likely to become increasingly difficult to provide parking close to one’s ultimate destination, in particular for commuters).

3.2 Road Capacity

The rationale for locating any MSCP’s peripheral is to maximise accessibility from the outer Gates and peripheral grid roads, in turn limiting the additional traffic penetrating further into the city centre. However, the 3 pronged strategy advocated will require some increase in the capacity of the road system to get peak traffic in and out of CMK, and to handle such peripheral MSCP’s.

The Expert Panel Meeting heard that the capacity/confession ‘pinch points’ are the peripheral grid road junctions immediately surrounding CMK, and that these have already been subject to a 25% capacity enhancement which is already being taken up by continuing traffic growth, and that further capacity increase of these roundabouts is not feasible. Therefore the options for further capacity enhancement of the grid road ‘pinch’ surrounding CMK appear to be:

- Roundabout separation
- Roundabout replacement with signals

Roundabout separation is almost certainly prohibitively costly, is expensive in land, and previous feasibility studies have questioned the engineering feasibility in particular in vertical alignment terms. Roundabout signalisation, whilst an option where sufficient stacking and circulation space can be created, has also been shown to be undesirable at most the grid road junction locations around CMK (in previous studies). The options with most potential for increasing capacity into CMK is signalisation of the current roundabout junctions on the grid road box (V6, B5, V8) - 10 junctions in total. Clearly detailed feasibility studies would be required. However conceptually the key components would be:
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- A state-of-the-art signalised area traffic control (SATIC) system is required to manage the CMK and the immediately surrounding grid road network effectively. The grid system is well designed for peak-hour and off-peak traffic. The grid system is not yet optimised for peak-hour traffic.

- To the motorist, the grid road system would become more apparent as CMK and less apparent as the citywide grid roads (as has already happened on V8 (Gladstone Gorge) and V7 (Station Gorge) through CMK. The face-to-face character of the grid road network throughout the city would not be threatened by this limited central signalisation.

- The H4 (Gazett Road) and H7 (Grafton Road) grid roads might be dualled to help keep non-CMK cross-city traffic away from the signalised grid road box.

4. LONG TERM VISION

4.1 Mass Rapid Transit?

This term covers trains, monorail and guided buses.

The Alliance Parking and Public Transport ‘Long Term Vision’ proposes a rapid transit system on major transport corridors, such as CMK, Station Road, and North-South linking Haymount with Wolverton via the Station, Dow and CMK Station.

The writer was a strong advocate of such a ‘blue sky’ concept throughout the period up to around 2003, based on large park and ride sites on each line. Secondary local buses fill the transit lines, with intensification of development within the city along the transit lines, with the lines extending beyond the current city limits into ‘expansion corridors’ where additional development surrounded the transit lines. Such ambitious plans were critical to dependent on these integrated infill developments and expansion corridors in order to generate the levels of demand required to sustain these high-capacity capital intensive systems.

In the event development plans have taken a very different direction to the extent that any opportunities that may have existed to further such a concept have now disappeared, - in the writer’s view forever. This is simply a matter of numbers – travel demand on the one hand, and system capacity and cost on the other, and they don’t match up. When the Alliance’s vision refers to advanced mass rapid transit through major transport corridors this writer firmly advises that this is not the real world as there are no ‘major transport corridors’ in MK existing or planned along which the demand for movement even approaches that required to sustain a rapid transit line including the CMK, Station Road, and North-South link; the ‘expansion corridor’. Whilst a ‘network’ system, such as the existing linking Station Square with the Station Road, may be desirable in ‘imaginative’ terms, we should guard against the pitfalls of being ‘seduced’ into believing it would be an important component of the city’s transport network. (The lesson of the monorail build to serve the Merry Hill Shopping Centre in the West Midlands at a cost of £300m some 20 years ago are instructive. Opended with great flourish in 1991, the monorail ceased operating in 1999 and was subsequently dismantled).

4.2 Personal Rapid Transit?

This term covers small emission free driverless vehicles computer controlled running on a network of segregated (elevated) tracks available on demand at stations, with dynamic routing. It is a more sophisticated development of the ‘people movers’ seen at some airports, but covering a more extensive ‘network’.

One such system ‘BeamCar’ was covered in the background papers provided to Expert Panel Members and its relatively similar to the ‘Auto Taxi’ concept developed in the 1970’s at the Government Transport & Road Research Laboratory. The Alliance’s Long Term Vision (3) envisages such a system providing intra-CMK movement including linking peripheral MSCP’s to the rest of CMK.

This vision is conceptually attractive. However it is also fatally flawed. To justify the cost of such a system, it must have good coverage throughout CMK and potentially replace a large proportion of car trips within CMK (otherwise there is no real ‘rationale’ for such a system). This means that any PRT system would necessarily have a high capacity (throughput) if it were to achieve any significant impact on reducing car trips within CMK. To achieve this objectives would have to run at a reasonable speed, but with very short headways, resulting in unacceptable safety and public perception problems (i.e. if one vehicle stops suddenly the successive vehicles collide with it, or the occupants perceive that this will happen and feel insecure). To overcome this the speed must be low and/or the gaps between vehicles increased to the extent that the system no longer has the capacity to carry the large numbers of passengers necessary to make it viable in a large urban centre such as CMK.
4.3 Issues Within a Balanced Strategy

Milton Keynes will not have a ‘premiership standard’ public transport system. That ‘prestige’ is precluded by the low density dispersed land use form which mitigates against the high density corridor flows required for efficient ‘mass’ public transport.

However, the challenge of accessing an ‘over-developed’ city centre served by a grid road network optimised for non-radial (dispersed) traffic flows can possibly be met by a well ‘balanced’ development and transport strategy incorporating the following components:

- A cautiously phased future development programme for CMK which acknowledges the inherent constraints in providing a transport system to efficiently serve it.

- An improved network of citywide bus services focused on CMK, traversing the centre along Midsomer Boulevard and possibly including emission free passage through CMK, an enhanced public realm without cars on Midsomer Boulevard and an institutional framework enabling the Council to specify the public transport and service quality it wishes to see. The ‘primary’ bus network would be reinforced by secondary services and other components together enabling the proportion of car journeys to the centre (in particular commuters) to be gradually reduced consistent with parking and road capacity, thus avoiding various road congestion.

- Modest enhancement of parking capacity in CMK by a combination of ground level car parks and peripheral MSGP’s, interfaced with a city centre wide state of the art signalled area traffic control system extending to and incorporating the grid road box immediately surrounding CMK.

It is concluded that future CMK planning should consider incorporating a detailed examination and testing of the ‘balanced’ landuse/transport strategy described in this paper.
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